

CLUSTER: GENERAL SUPERVISION (PART B)

OBJECTIVE: Effective general supervision of the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is ensured through the State Education Agency's (SEA) and Lead Agency's (LA) development and utilization of mechanisms and activities, in a coordinated system, that results in all eligible children with disabilities having an opportunity to receive free appropriate public education (FAPE) in the least restrictive environment (LRE).

Notes:

- Components and indicators marked with an “*” are included in Cluster Lite.
- Related professional development is listed under the indicators. For descriptions of the professional development, please refer to the Comprehensive System of Professional Development section.
- General notes about the data analyzed in this report can be found in the Data Explanations section.

Component GS.1*: Is free appropriate public education (FAPE) for children with disabilities ensured because the State's systems for monitoring, and other mechanisms for ensuring compliance, and parent and child protections, are coordinated, and because decision-making is based on the collection, analysis and utilization of data from all available sources?

- a. Do parents and eligible youth with disabilities have an awareness of and access to, their right to effective systems for parent and child protections?
- b. Is the provision of FAPE to children with disabilities ensured by the timely resolution of child complaints, resolution conferences, mediations and due process hearings and methods for ensuring compliance that correct identified deficiencies?
- c. Is the provision of FAPE for children with disabilities ensured because methods are in place to correct identified compliance deficiencies in a timely manner?
- d. Are systemic issues identified and remediated through the analysis of findings from complaint investigations, due process hearings and information and data collected from all available sources?

Overview Answer: Missouri's monitoring system and parent and child protection systems do work together to ensure free appropriate public education for children with disabilities.

All parents of children with disabilities are to be given a copy of Procedural Safeguards when they enter the system. Monitoring data suggests that very few districts are out of compliance in regards to providing the Procedural Safeguards when required. Those districts that are initially out of compliance usually are in compliance at subsequent follow-ups. However, simply providing copies of the Procedural Safeguards does not ensure that parents and students understand their rights. Currently there are no mechanisms to measure understanding. Survey questions can be included in the Missouri School Improvement Program Advanced Parent Questionnaire that will provide information relative to this question.

The number of child complaints filed and due process hearings requested suggests that parents do have access to these systems. In the past, child complaint timelines have not been met consistently, however there was notable improvement in this area in the 2001-2002 school year. The majority of due process hearings are not completed within forty-five days, however all but one have been completed within appropriate extensions of the timelines during the past three years.

Many changes were made to Missouri's monitoring system for Third Cycle cycle. Changes include new standards and indicators that look at systemic issues, standards that look for improved performance of students with disabilities, a new Compliance Monitoring System which will allow for detailed analysis of issues, a new database for recording child complaint, due process and mediation information which will allow for analysis of issues and a system which more closely ties the monitoring and protection systems together.

Strengths: Missouri now has more data than before and reports from the monitoring system are now automated. Missouri has a monitoring system in place that includes follow-up monitoring until districts are in compliance. As a result of the change in monitoring procedures, one of the expectations is that data from the system will be available for analysis to inform and shape the type of strategies that will need to be developed to contribute to systemic change.

The number of child complaints has been declining in the last five years, and the percent of complaints extended beyond sixty days has been cut in half in the 2001-2002 school year.

Areas of Concern: There is concern about the access and utilization of mediation. An initiative offered during the 2001-2002 school year would have provided money to pay for mediation before due process, however not one mediation was requested under this initiative. Some parents have expressed concerns that schools are not willing to go to mediation. There is a concern regarding having school personnel on the list of mediators. Further study is needed to determine the reasons for the lack of usage.

Other Comments: Possible improvement strategies suggested by the committee include the following:

- DESE tracking (to include issues and categorization of technical assistance provided) via telephone/web is desired
- DESE to gather information on other advocacy groups within the state and provide parents and youth with information
- DESE should list Missouri Protection and Advocacy (P&A) on the Procedural Safeguard Statement along with Missouri Parents Act (MPACT).

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.1.1: What systems are in place for protecting the rights of parents and children and youth with disabilities?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child Complaint Log • Due Process Hearing Log • Mediation Booklet • Resolution Conference • Procedural Safeguards • MPACT Contact Activity Report • Missouri P&A Program Performance Summary <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ECSE Practices Manual • Hearing Officer Training • Leadership Series – Compliance, Visually Impaired • Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks • Missouri Parents Act • Missouri School for the Blind Outreach • Missouri School for the Deaf Outreach • Parent Advisory Council Training • Parents Roles Brochures • Practical Parenting Partnerships • Third Cycle Monitoring 	<p>Data Summary: Missouri has advocacy organizations including Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) and Missouri Protection and Advocacy (P&A). The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has procedures for monitoring and for handling child complaints and due process hearing requests.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Data indicates that DESE monitoring procedures, the child complaint and due process systems, P&A, MPACT and other advocacy organizations are the systems in place for protecting the rights of parents and children with disabilities.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.1.2: Are parents and youth with disabilities aware of the systems for parent and child protections?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus group data • Monitoring data • Missouri P&A Program Performance Summary • MPACT Contact Activity Report <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the General Education Curriculum – Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) • Center for Innovations in Education • First Steps Bulletins • Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin • Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) • Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Training • Parents Role Brochures 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Focus Group Summary</p> <p>All the parents who participated in the focus groups reported that they had been given a copy of the Procedural Safeguards. However, very few read them until they were confronted with a concern and problem. At that point, they did not find the procedural safeguards very understandable. The parents were aware that there are systems for parent and child protections but they wanted materials that were much easier to understand.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Procedural Safeguards-1 – Individuals responsible for the provision of services to children with disabilities are informed of the procedural safeguard rights for parents and children: 19 of 92, 20.65 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Indicator A 104040.07 – Copy of the procedural safeguards statement provided with Prior Written Notice of Reevaluation: 1 of 2, 50.00 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very small number of districts were monitored under requirement of provision of procedural safeguards with a Notice of Intent to Reevaluate, due to most districts determining in the reevaluation process that no additional data was needed or that the data to be collected did not require the Provision of Notice with Consent. <p>FY2002 Monitoring Indicator B 100300 – Full explanation of all procedural safeguards at referral: 25 of 94, 26.60 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Indicator B 104570 – Parent is provided a copy of Procedural Safeguards with notification of an Individual educational program (IEP) meeting: 18 of 93, 19.35 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
GS.1.2: Continued	Monitoring Indicator 100250 – Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Action Refused																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>20</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>23</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>40</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	20	3	1	0	FY2000	23	1	0		FY2001	40	0		
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	20	3	1	0																
	FY2000	23	1	0																	
	FY2001	40	0																		
	Monitoring Indicator 100550 – Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Action for Ineligibility																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>67</td><td>9</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>85</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>92</td><td>6</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	67	9	0	0	FY2000	85	5	0		FY2001	92	6	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	67	9	0	0																
	FY2000	85	5	0																	
	FY2001	92	6	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 100670 – Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Change of Placement at Graduation																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>73</td><td>13</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>80</td><td>6</td><td>1</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>88</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	73	13	1	0	FY2000	80	6	1	Incomplete	FY2001	88	3	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	73	13	1	0																
	FY2000	80	6	1	Incomplete																
FY2001	88	3	Incomplete																		
Monitoring Indicator 102110 – Procedural Safeguards provided upon referral for evaluation																					
<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>86</td><td>26</td><td>8</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>105</td><td>37</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>103</td><td>41</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	86	26	8	0	FY2000	105	37	3	Incomplete	FY2001	103	41	Incomplete		
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																	
FY1999	86	26	8	0																	
FY2000	105	37	3	Incomplete																	
FY2001	103	41	Incomplete																		

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
GS.1.2: Continued	Monitoring Indicator 104250 – Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice of Change in Services																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>73</td><td>29</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>99</td><td>15</td><td>2</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>87</td><td>12</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	73	29	3	0	FY2000	99	15	2	Incomplete	FY2001	87	12	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	73	29	3	0																
	FY2000	99	15	2	Incomplete																
	FY2001	87	12	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 105100 – Procedural Safeguards provided with notification of an IEP meeting																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>93</td><td>27</td><td>5</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>108</td><td>28</td><td>2</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>105</td><td>21</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	93	27	5	0	FY2000	108	28	2	Incomplete	FY2001	105	21	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	93	27	5	0																
	FY2000	108	28	2	Incomplete																
	FY2001	105	21	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 106200 – Procedural Safeguards provided with Notice to Reevaluate																				
	<table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>85</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>101</td><td>5</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>102</td><td>5</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	85	4	1	0	FY2000	101	5	0		FY2001	102	5	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
FY1999	85	4	1	0																	
FY2000	101	5	0																		
FY2001	102	5	Incomplete																		
Missouri Protection & Advocacy (P&A) Performance Summary																					
<table><tr><td>Service Provided</td><td>FY 1999</td><td>FY 2000</td></tr><tr><td>Information & Referral Services</td><td>336</td><td>364</td></tr><tr><td>FAPE Complaints</td><td>182</td><td>190</td></tr><tr><td>Number of Clients</td><td>234</td><td>252</td></tr></table>	Service Provided	FY 1999	FY 2000	Information & Referral Services	336	364	FAPE Complaints	182	190	Number of Clients	234	252									
Service Provided	FY 1999	FY 2000																			
Information & Referral Services	336	364																			
FAPE Complaints	182	190																			
Number of Clients	234	252																			

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																								
<p>GS.1.2: Concluded</p>	<div><p>Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) Activity Report</p><table><tr><td>Method of Contact</td><td>FY 2000</td></tr><tr><td>In Person</td><td>72</td></tr><tr><td>Mail</td><td>81</td></tr><tr><td>Phone</td><td>1,275</td></tr><tr><td>Volunteer</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Workshop</td><td>594</td></tr></table></div> <p>Committee Conclusions: Data indicates that many parents are aware of systems. Local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to provide copies of Procedural Safeguards on several different occasions. Monitoring data shows that many districts are out of compliance in terms of provision of Safeguards, but many are found in compliance at the first follow-up. Services provided by Missouri Protection and Advocacy (P&A) and Missouri Parents Act (MPACT) are utilized. In addition, there are Parent’s Guides available in paper form and on the internet.</p> <p>What is not clear from the data is whether or not parents and children understand their rights. Focus group results indicate that more needs to be done to help parents understand their rights. A suggested way to gather more information may be to incorporate questions specific to parents of students with disabilities on the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Advanced Questionnaire. Parents in LEAs that are going through MSIP monitoring could be asked to respond to questions dealing with the receipt and understanding of Procedural Safeguards.</p>	Method of Contact	FY 2000	In Person	72	Mail	81	Phone	1,275	Volunteer	5	Workshop	594												
Method of Contact	FY 2000																								
In Person	72																								
Mail	81																								
Phone	1,275																								
Volunteer	5																								
Workshop	594																								
<p>GS.1.3: Do parents and youth with disabilities have access to the systems for parent and child protections?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mediation Logs• Due Process Hearing Logs• Child Complaint Logs	<p>Data Summary:</p> <div><p>Child Complaint, Due Process and Mediation Summary</p><table><tr><td></td><td>FY 97-98</td><td>FY 98-99</td><td>FY 99-00</td><td>FY 00-01</td><td>FY 01-02</td></tr><tr><td>Child Complaints Filed</td><td>175</td><td>137</td><td>134</td><td>124</td><td>126</td></tr><tr><td>Due Process Requests</td><td>71</td><td>75</td><td>95</td><td>100</td><td>70</td></tr><tr><td>Mediation Requests</td><td>13</td><td>15</td><td>7</td><td>15</td><td>7</td></tr></table></div> <p>Committee Conclusions: Based on the number of child complaints filed and/or due process hearings requested, it would seem that parents and youth who understand their rights do have access to systems for parent and child protections. Also, data in GS.1.2 shows that many contacts are made each year through P&A and MPACT. These organizations are an important part of the system and assist parents in accessing the systems for child and parent protections.</p>		FY 97-98	FY 98-99	FY 99-00	FY 00-01	FY 01-02	Child Complaints Filed	175	137	134	124	126	Due Process Requests	71	75	95	100	70	Mediation Requests	13	15	7	15	7
	FY 97-98	FY 98-99	FY 99-00	FY 00-01	FY 01-02																				
Child Complaints Filed	175	137	134	124	126																				
Due Process Requests	71	75	95	100	70																				
Mediation Requests	13	15	7	15	7																				

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																								
<p>GS.1.4*: Are child complaints resolved in a timely manner?</p> <p>Data sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Child Complaint Logs	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Summary of Length of Child Complaint Extensions Beyond 60 Days</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>97-98</td><td>98-99</td><td>99-00</td><td>00-01</td><td>01-02</td></tr><tr><td>Total Complaints*</td><td>164</td><td>136</td><td>128</td><td>123</td><td>126</td></tr><tr><td>Total Extended Beyond 60 Days</td><td>21</td><td>23</td><td>17</td><td>22</td><td>6</td></tr><tr><td>Percent Extended Beyond 60 Days</td><td>12.8%</td><td>16.9%</td><td>13.3%</td><td>17.9%</td><td>4.7%</td></tr></table> <p>* Excludes Hearing Officer impartiality complaints</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: In FY2002, the Division of Special Education created a position of Child Complaint Coordinator. Having one person to coordinate all activities regarding child complaints has been instrumental in decreasing the number of child complaint extensions. This change was due to the number of extensions in prior years and the workloads of other monitoring supervisors. The new child complaint database provides a regular report of child complaints that are nearing the end of timelines.</p>		97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	Total Complaints*	164	136	128	123	126	Total Extended Beyond 60 Days	21	23	17	22	6	Percent Extended Beyond 60 Days	12.8%	16.9%	13.3%	17.9%	4.7%
	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02																				
Total Complaints*	164	136	128	123	126																				
Total Extended Beyond 60 Days	21	23	17	22	6																				
Percent Extended Beyond 60 Days	12.8%	16.9%	13.3%	17.9%	4.7%																				
<p>GS.1.5*: Are due process hearings resolved in a timely manner?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Due Process Hearing Logs <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Hearing Officer Training	<p>Data Summary: In the past three years, only one due process hearing was out of compliance for timelines.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Due process hearings generally are not resolved within forty-five days, however hearing timelines were appropriately extended at the request of the parent, the district, or both.</p>																								

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																										
<p>GS.1.6*: Are mediations resolved in a timely manner?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Mediation Log	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="6">Mediation Resolutions</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>97-98</th><th>98-99</th><th>99-00</th><th>00-01</th><th>01-02</th></tr><tr><td>Total Mediations</td><td>13</td><td>15</td><td>7</td><td>15</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>Mediations Resulting in Withdrawal</td><td>7</td><td>7</td><td>3</td><td>12</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>Mediations Not Resulting in Withdrawal</td><td>6</td><td>8</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Mediations Pending</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>Percent Successful</td><td>53.8%</td><td>46.7%</td><td>42.9%</td><td>80.0%</td><td>71.4%</td></tr></table> <p>Committee Conclusions: Data regarding when mediations are requested and when the mediation process ended are not currently collected. According to data, there is a general upward trend in the percent of successful mediations.</p>	Mediation Resolutions							97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	Total Mediations	13	15	7	15	7	Mediations Resulting in Withdrawal	7	7	3	12	5	Mediations Not Resulting in Withdrawal	6	8	4	1	1	Mediations Pending	0	0	0	2	1	Percent Successful	53.8%	46.7%	42.9%	80.0%	71.4%
Mediation Resolutions																																											
	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02																																						
Total Mediations	13	15	7	15	7																																						
Mediations Resulting in Withdrawal	7	7	3	12	5																																						
Mediations Not Resulting in Withdrawal	6	8	4	1	1																																						
Mediations Pending	0	0	0	2	1																																						
Percent Successful	53.8%	46.7%	42.9%	80.0%	71.4%																																						
<p>GS.1.7: Are resolution conferences resolved in a timely manner?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">None	<p>Data Summary: No data</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) does not currently collect this data.</p>																																										

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																												
<p>GS.1.8*: Are decisions in complaint investigations, mediations, and due process hearings and reviews, which result in corrective actions, implemented in a timely manner?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Due Process Request Logs• Mediation Requests• Child Complaint Logs	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Child Complaint Decisions Requiring a Corrective Action</th></tr><tr><th>Year</th><th># Of Corrective Actions Ordered</th><th># Received Within Timelines*</th><th>% Received Within Timelines*</th></tr><tr><td>97-98</td><td>78</td><td>50</td><td>64%</td></tr><tr><td>98-99</td><td>53</td><td>43</td><td>81%</td></tr><tr><td>99-00</td><td>66</td><td>43</td><td>65%</td></tr><tr><td>00-01</td><td>76</td><td>38</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>01-02</td><td>63</td><td>33 (8 not due yet)</td><td>65%</td></tr></table> <p>Data as of August 2002</p> <p>*The timelines for child complaints refer to the date that the documentation of the correction action was received by DESE, not the actual date that the action was implemented.</p> <p>Due Process Logs only identify the date when decisions are made, not when the corrective action was implemented. Mediation agreements are not collected so timeliness of the implementation of changes is unknown.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>The table above indicates that many corrective actions were not completed within forty-five days of the child complaint decisions. The child complaint database (implemented in the 2001-02 school year) allows for electronic monitoring of overdue timelines. Staff query the database for corrective actions that have not been received within forty-five days of the decision. If a corrective action is late, the district is contacted and, in many cases, this contact results in the district providing documentation that the corrective action has been implemented.</p> <p>We cannot determine whether decisions are implemented in a timely manner for due process. DESE receives due process hearing decisions but there is no follow-up on implementation unless the parent files a child complaint that the due process decision has not been implemented. Many due process decisions are stayed pending appeal to court.</p>	Child Complaint Decisions Requiring a Corrective Action				Year	# Of Corrective Actions Ordered	# Received Within Timelines*	% Received Within Timelines*	97-98	78	50	64%	98-99	53	43	81%	99-00	66	43	65%	00-01	76	38	50%	01-02	63	33 (8 not due yet)	65%
Child Complaint Decisions Requiring a Corrective Action																													
Year	# Of Corrective Actions Ordered	# Received Within Timelines*	% Received Within Timelines*																										
97-98	78	50	64%																										
98-99	53	43	81%																										
99-00	66	43	65%																										
00-01	76	38	50%																										
01-02	63	33 (8 not due yet)	65%																										
<p>GS.1.9*: Are enforcement actions used when necessary to address persistent deficiencies?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monitoring data• State Plan	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>Monitoring data can be found under other components and indicators throughout this self-assessment.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>DESE data reflects that districts found to be out of compliance on special education indicators are reviewed annually. Reviews continue until the district is compliant in all areas. Data reflects that most districts take necessary action within the first year. Some districts require second or third monitoring visits to reach compliance or to address deficiencies. Sanctions are included in the State Plan (enforcement procedures are outlined in Sections II and VII), however districts are given every opportunity to correct deficiencies before sanctions are used. Through the new Compliance Monitoring System and child complaint/due process database, a more in-depth look will be taken of districts whose child complaint/due process history indicates a systemic issue. Enforcement procedures are outlined in Sections II and VII of the Missouri State Plan for Special Education 2001.</p>																												

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.1.10*: Are findings from complaint investigations, due process hearings and review decisions, and other data, used as an integral part of the state's monitoring system?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education Monitoring Self Assessment (SEMSA) worksheet 	<p>Data Summary: The Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA) worksheet being used in Third Cycle monitoring includes child complaint and due process information for each district. In addition to the number of complaints filed and due process hearings requested, information on the topics is provided in order to check for systemic problems.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) monitoring procedures for 1996 through 2001 required supervisors to review child complaint information prior to the districts on-site visit. Supervisors incorporated this information into their reviews as appropriate.</p> <p>In the third monitoring cycle that began with FY2002, monitoring supervisors are incorporating child complaints, due process hearing requests, areas of persistent noncompliance, public input, and unique/emerging issues into the state's monitoring system. All of these are taken into account when determining which districts will receive on-site monitoring visits rather than desk reviews. See the Monitoring overview for additional information.</p>
<p>GS.1.11*: Is information collected through DESE monitoring used to effect systems change?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education Monitoring Interview Packets • Presentation by DESE staff <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the General Education Curriculum – Least Restrictive Environment, Problem Solving for General Education Intervention • Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment • Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin • Leadership Series 	<p>Data Summary: None</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Data from monitoring results as well as the results of child complaint decisions and due process hearing decisions is reviewed to identify statewide issues of non-compliance. Once identified, public agencies are provided with technical assistance on the compliance requirements surrounding the issues and how to implement effective systems change to meet compliance requirements in these areas. These areas are also identified as "focus areas" in the monitoring process. As a result of the change in monitoring procedures, one of the expectations is that data from the system will be available for analysis to inform the type of strategies that will need to be developed to contribute to systemic change.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.1.11*: Concluded</p> <p>Related CSPD: Concluded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning to Develop Measurable Goals, Objectives and Benchmarks • Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP) • Priority Schools • Secondary Transition 	<p>The Compliance section offers a number of training and technical assistance activities. These activities are developed based upon data analysis of the results of monitoring, child complaint and due process hearing decisions, phone calls and web inquiries from the field. From these analyses, critical compliance issues are identified and incorporated into training activities, technical assistance and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) documents. The Compliance Section offers a Leadership I & II series for new and veteran special education staff. Especially in the Leadership II series, those critical issues are discussed and training provided on how to implement change at the local level to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations. The Compliance section website contains a FAQ section which is updated on a regular basis to address any critical compliance issues that need to be communicated to the field. Other technical assistance activities provided include presentations at Local Administrators of Special Education (LASE) meetings, professional conferences and local district in-service days.</p>
<p>GS.1.12*: Do the monitoring instruments and procedures used by the SEA /LA identify IDEA compliance?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p>Data Summary: None</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Yes. A comparison of issues found out of compliance in agency monitoring with issues raised and found out of compliance in due process and child compliant decisions found that the areas of noncompliance were very similar. In addition, results from the first year of the Third Cycle of State Education Agency (SEA) monitoring confirmed that agency compliance calls on their own self-assessments were very similar to the compliance calls made by SEA monitors on-site. There are still some areas of compliance that cannot be monitored through a paper review process that need to be developed. The SEA is working on the development/refinement of procedures in those areas.</p>
<p>GS.1.13*: Are deficiencies identified through the state's system for ensuring general supervision corrected in a timely manner?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due Process Request Logs • Mediation Requests • Child Complaint Logs • Monitoring data • State Plan 	<p>Data Summary: See GS.1.8 and GS.1.9</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: See GS.1.8 and GS.1.9</p>

Component GS.2*: Are appropriate and timely services ensured through interagency coordination and assignment of fiscal responsibility?

Overview Answer: It has been noted that interagency agreement language addressing child find, evaluation and provision of services is not consistent. State plan (regulations) specify duties of state agencies, local districts for child find and evaluation to confirm disabilities.
Strengths:
Areas of Concern: Interagency agreements are not consistent and have not been reviewed on a regular basis.
Other Comments: The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) will establish an Interagency Review Schedule where each agreement will specify its review dates and renewal requirements. New interagency agreements will establish interagency dispute procedures that need to be in place for interagency agreements where internal procedures are not applicable.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.2.1: What interagency agreements exist and to what extent are they being followed?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)/Division of Medical Services (DMS) for Medicaid billing • Head Start • Vocational Rehabilitation • Department of Mental Health (DMH) – Autism <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autism • Heads-Up Reading • Leadership Series – Funds • Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP) • Secondary Transition 	<p>Data Summary: Four interagency agreements exist.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: No data is available as to what extent they are being followed.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																																										
<p>GS.2.2*: Are child find, evaluation, and provision of services coordinated in a timely manner through interagency agreements and other mechanisms?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)/Division of Medical Services (DMS) for Medicaid Billing• Head Start• Vocational Rehabilitation• Department of Mental Health (DMH) – Autism• State Plan for Special Education <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Autism• Leadership Series – Compliance, Compliance and Data, Data• Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)• Quality Eligibility Decisions• Secondary Transition	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Interagency Agreement Coordination of Services</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>Child Find</th><th>Evaluation</th><th>Provision of Services</th><th>Payment</th><th>Training</th></tr><tr><td>Division of Medical Services</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>Yes</td><td>N/A</td></tr><tr><td>Head Start</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Vocational Rehabilitation</td><td>N/A</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td><td>Yes</td></tr><tr><td>Dept of Mental Health-Autism</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>N/A</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table> <p>Yes = Present in Interagency Agreement</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Percentage (Based on Estimated Resident Population) of Children Served under IDEA, Part B</p> <table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">1998-1999</th><th colspan="2">1999-2000</th><th colspan="2">2000-2001</th></tr><tr><td>Ages</td><td>3-5</td><td>6-21</td><td>3-5</td><td>6-21</td><td>3-5</td><td>6-21</td></tr><tr><td>Missouri</td><td>4.34</td><td>9.55</td><td>4.85</td><td>9.71</td><td>5.04</td><td>9.65</td></tr><tr><td>50 States and DC</td><td>4.88</td><td>8.82</td><td>5.05</td><td>8.92</td><td>5.04</td><td>8.75</td></tr></table> <p>Source: Annual Report to Congress</p>		Child Find	Evaluation	Provision of Services	Payment	Training	Division of Medical Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	Head Start	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Vocational Rehabilitation	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Dept of Mental Health-Autism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes		1998-1999		1999-2000		2000-2001		Ages	3-5	6-21	3-5	6-21	3-5	6-21	Missouri	4.34	9.55	4.85	9.71	5.04	9.65	50 States and DC	4.88	8.82	5.05	8.92	5.04	8.75
	Child Find	Evaluation	Provision of Services	Payment	Training																																																						
Division of Medical Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A																																																						
Head Start	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes																																																						
Vocational Rehabilitation	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes																																																						
Dept of Mental Health-Autism	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes																																																						
	1998-1999		1999-2000		2000-2001																																																						
Ages	3-5	6-21	3-5	6-21	3-5	6-21																																																					
Missouri	4.34	9.55	4.85	9.71	5.04	9.65																																																					
50 States and DC	4.88	8.82	5.05	8.92	5.04	8.75																																																					

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.2.2*: Concluded</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Child Find-1 – The responsible public agency conducts public awareness activities as required: 14 of 94, 14.89 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the local educational agencies (LEAs) found out of compliance for this standard had failed to make radio or television announcements, but they had engaged in other forms of public awareness activities. • Only one district was called out of compliance due to failure to produce a summary of the policies and procedures regarding storage, disclosure to third parties, retention and destruction of personally identifiable information in regards to child find activities. <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Child Find-2 – Eligibility determinations result in the percentage of students with disabilities served being comparable to statewide data: not monitored in FY2002 due to changes in eligibility criteria in new state plan.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Interagency agreement language addressing child find, evaluation and provision of services is not consistent. The state plan (regulations) specifies duties of state agencies and local districts for child find and evaluation to confirm disabilities. Most LEAs are in compliance with child find requirements.</p> <p>Data from the Annual Report to Congress shows that Missouri’s percentage of children served was either equal to or above national averages in FY2001. In addition the percentage of three to five-year-olds served has been increasing annually. This would indicate that child find efforts are effective.</p>
<p>GS.2.3*: Does the state education agency (SEA)/lead agency (LA) develop and implement coordinated service systems to minimize duplication and ensure effective services delivery?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p>Data Summary: None</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Currently, most interagency agreements make no provision for financial responsibility other than educational agencies. Therefore duplication is minimal and effective services delivery is ensured.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																							
<p>GS.2.4: Are agreements reviewed and/or revised?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)/Division of Medical Services (DMS) for Medicaid Billing• Head Start• Vocational Rehabilitation• Department of Mental Health (DMH) - Autism	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th>Agreement</th><th>Original Date</th><th>Review Revised</th><th>Schedule</th></tr><tr><td>Division of Medical Services</td><td>7/1/99</td><td>3/27/02</td><td>Periodic Updates</td></tr><tr><td>Head Start</td><td>Jan. 1995</td><td>In Process</td><td>Annually</td></tr><tr><td>Vocational Rehabilitation</td><td>11/30/98</td><td>2/21/02</td><td>Annually</td></tr><tr><td>Department of Mental Health(DMH) - Autism</td><td>10/24/96</td><td>None</td><td>Annually</td></tr></table> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Review schedules appear to have been followed with regard to Division of Medical Services (DMH), Head Start and Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) agreements. However, the DMH-Autism agreement was last reviewed on October 24, 1996 and, therefore, has not been reviewed annually as the agreement states.</p> <p>The committee recommends establishing an Interagency Agreement Review Schedule, and that interagency dispute procedures need to be in place for interagency agreements where internal procedures are not applicable. Template language for interagency agreements would ensure all components are covered.</p>				Agreement	Original Date	Review Revised	Schedule	Division of Medical Services	7/1/99	3/27/02	Periodic Updates	Head Start	Jan. 1995	In Process	Annually	Vocational Rehabilitation	11/30/98	2/21/02	Annually	Department of Mental Health(DMH) - Autism	10/24/96	None	Annually
Agreement	Original Date	Review Revised	Schedule																					
Division of Medical Services	7/1/99	3/27/02	Periodic Updates																					
Head Start	Jan. 1995	In Process	Annually																					
Vocational Rehabilitation	11/30/98	2/21/02	Annually																					
Department of Mental Health(DMH) - Autism	10/24/96	None	Annually																					

COMPONENT GS.3*: Is free appropriate public education (FAPE) provided to children with disabilities served in juvenile and adult correctional facilities in the state?

Overview Answer: Juvenile detention centers are monitored by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) when the school district in which they are located is monitored. The student records for students in juvenile detention centers are included in the overall district results and cannot be isolated to allow the committee to draw conclusions on the provision of FAPE. Special education programs through the Division of Youth Services (DYS) and the Department of Corrections (DOC) are monitored on a regular basis, thereby ensuring FAPE.

Strengths: Legislation has been passed that provides for easier exchange of information between executive divisions to better serve students, primarily in juvenile justice. The relationship between DESE and other agencies is collaborative and cooperative regarding monitoring of students served by other agencies. The Division of Youth Services (DYS) and the Department of Corrections (DOC) have a memorandum of agreement to provide services in their youthful offender facilities.

Areas of Concern: DESE has not monitored local districts for the provision of FAPE in city/county jails.

Other Comments: A survey of Juvenile Detention Centers and local county/city adult facilities (jails) will be completed during the 2002-2003 school year. The purpose of the survey will be to identify procedures used to identify students with disabilities in these facilities and to identify agreements that may exist with local school districts to provide special education services to students with disabilities. Depending on the situation revealed by these surveys, DESE may mandate that intake procedures in each facility include identification of students with disabilities.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.3.1: Is free appropriate public education (FAPE) provided to children and youth with disabilities placed in juvenile facilities? (Juvenile Detention Centers)</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2001 Missouri Juvenile and Family Court Directory <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Series – Compliance, Compliance and Data, Data • Third Cycle Monitoring 	<p>Data Summary: There are twenty-four Juvenile Court Detention Facilities in the state.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Juvenile detention centers are monitored by DESE when the school district in which they are located is monitored. The student records for students in juvenile detention centers are included in the overall district results and cannot be isolated to allow the committee to draw conclusions on the provision of FAPE.</p> <p>Several questions need to be answered in order to fully answer this question. Questions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are programs serving youth with disabilities monitored? • What communications take place between the host district and the juvenile detention center? • What procedures are used by juvenile detention centers in the state to identify students with disabilities in their facilities? • What agreements exist with local school districts to provide special education services to those students?
<p>GS.3.2: Is FAPE provided to children and youth with disabilities placed in Division of Youth Services (DYS) facilities?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring data • DYS State Board Summary of Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) Review • Child Complaint/Due Process data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Series – Compliance, Compliance and Data, Data • Third Cycle Monitoring 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Division of Youth Services Special Education Monitoring Summary</p> <p>The Division of Youth Services' last initial monitoring was conducted in FY01. At that point they were found out of compliance in several areas. Their first follow-up monitoring was conducted in FY02. DYS continues to be noncompliant in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior Written Notice for change of placement and consent to reevaluate • Notification of IEP Meetings • Out of State Transfer Procedures <p>These decisions were determined through a lack of sufficient documentation. Areas of noncompliance will be addressed in a second follow-up.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Division of Youth Services MSIP Monitoring Summary</p> <p>DYS' last MSIP review was conducted in FY01. This review looks at all students, including students with disabilities. The overall classification recommendation of the Department of School Improvement Program Review Committee was "Accredited." A noted strength was the increase in the percentage of exiting students receiving General Equivalency Diploma (GED) certificates for five of the last seven years. A noted concern was the lack of significant increase in the average daily attendance of students assigned to day treatment programs.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.3.2: Concluded</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Division of Youth Services (DYS) Child Complaint/Due Process Summary</p> <p>In the past three years, there has only been one child complaint against DYS. This occurred in FY01. The allegation was regarding the Individualized Education Program (IEP) wherein DYS was found out of compliance and a corrective action was required. No due process hearings have been requested.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: Monitoring data of DYS indicates free and appropriate public education (FAPE) is generally provided to children and youth with disabilities placed in DYS facilities. DYS is monitored every five years by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) and is scheduled to be monitored again in FY06.</p> <p>Beginning in FY03, DYS will provide disaggregated performance data for students with and without disabilities. This data will provide valuable information on the quality of the educational services that are provided to youth with disabilities placed in the Division of Youth Services.</p>
<p>GS.3.3: Is FAPE provided to youth with disabilities placed in local adult correctional facilities (county/city jails)?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p>Data Summary: No data is available.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: DESE has not monitored local districts for the provision of FAPE in city/county jails.</p>
<p>GS.3.4: Is FAPE provided to youth with disabilities placed in state adult correctional facilities (Department of Corrections)?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring data • Child Complaint/Due Process data 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Department of Corrections (DOC) Special Education Monitoring Summary</p> <p>The Department of Corrections' last initial monitoring was conducted in June 2001. At that point they were found out of compliance in the areas of Notice of Action, Exit Interviews, Provision of the most current version of Procedural Safeguards and Provision of Services. In total, DOC was found in compliance for thirty-three items and out of compliance for six items. Forty items were not applicable to the DOC. The Education Supervisor /Special Education at the DOC has indicated that several of the areas of noncompliance have already been corrected; however the official follow-up monitoring has not yet occurred.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Department of Corrections Child Complaint/Due Process Summary</p> <p>In the past three years, there have not been any child complaints or due process hearing requests involving the DOC.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.3.4: Concluded</p>	<p>Committee Conclusions: Monitoring data for the Department of Corrections (DOC) indicates that the Special Education process for determining services in not always followed and that the provision of services in accordance with the IEP does not always occur. The follow-up monitoring visit for DOC will be conducted during FY03. DOC is monitored on a five-year cycle, along with all school districts in Missouri.</p> <p>Beginning in FY03, DOC will provide disaggregated performance data for students with and without disabilities. These data will provide valuable information on the quality of the educational services that are provided to youth with disabilities placed in the Department of Corrections.</p>

Component GS.4*: Are appropriate special education and related services provided to children with disabilities served in out-of-district placements (e.g., non-public schools, consortia, etc.) under the direction and supervision of the public agency, and in state operated programs (e.g. departments for mental health or mental retardation, schools for the blind and deaf, etc.)?

Overview Answer: Based on most recent special education monitoring, State Board Operated Programs, including Missouri School for the Blind (MSB), Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD) and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH), are providing free appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities. Students in private agencies are included in Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) monitoring activities when the district of residence is monitored. The Department of Mental Health (DMH) is in the process of being monitored and a preliminary report is not yet available. DMH is monitored in the same way that all other Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), State Operated Programs, Department of Corrections (DOC) and Division of Youth Services (DYS) are monitored.

Strengths: MSB, MSD and SSSH are regularly monitored by the state and all are in compliance at this time. Students in out-of-district placements are also being monitored. Missouri treats Charter Schools like a Local Education Agency (LEA), they are monitored and any child complaints/due process hearing requests are handled the same as for other LEAs.

Areas of Concern: Monitoring results indicate that these schools are in compliance with all applicable regulations, however, performance at MSB and MSD is poor. New monitoring procedures will now hold the schools accountable for performance standards, however MSB and MSD will not be reviewed again until FY2005. Private agencies are only monitored through student files when the districts of residence are monitored, resulting in no global oversight of the private agencies.

Other Comments: The poor performance at MSB and MSD needs to be addressed. A structured annual on-site monitoring process needs to be developed for private agencies.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.4.1: Is free appropriate public education (FAPE) being provided to children with disabilities served in out-of-district placements? (Definition: Contractual arrangements made by a school district (public agency) with another school district or an approved private agency for services to a student with a disability, excluding co-op agreements.)</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private agencies listed by district • Approved private agency listing • Number of students in contractual placements for last three years 	<p>Data Summary: Files on out-of-district placements are reviewed as part of Local Educational Agency (LEA) special education monitoring, but data is not disaggregated to make judgement.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: An LEA file review alone is not sufficient data to determine if FAPE is provided to children with disabilities served in out-of-district placements. A structured annual on-site monitoring process needs to be developed for private agencies.</p>
<p>GS.4.2: Is FAPE being provided to children with disabilities served in state operated programs which include Missouri School for the Blind (MSB), Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD) and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH)?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring data • Graduation/Dropout data • Performance data • Final special education reports for MSB, MSD and SSSH • Office of Civil Rights (OCR) data, child complaint, and due process data for MSB, MSD and SSSH 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Missouri School for the Blind (MSB) Monitoring Summary</p> <p>MSB's last initial monitoring review was conducted in FY00. At that time MSB was found out of compliance in many areas. Resulting from the poor results, the Division's Director of Compliance provided a technical assistance workshop for the staff at MSB. A follow-up review, conducted in FY02, found MSB to be in compliance in all areas.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD) Monitoring Summary</p> <p>MSD's last initial monitoring review was conducted in FY00. After a follow-up was conducted in FY01, all items were found to be in compliance.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH) Monitoring Summary</p> <p>SSSH's last initial monitoring review was conducted in FY99. A follow-up conducted in FY02 found all items in compliance.</p>

**LIST THE QUESTIONS THE
COMMITTEE STUDIED AND
THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED**

SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION

GS.4.2: Continued

MAP Index* - Missouri School for the Deaf

	CA-3	CA-7	CA-11	M-4	M-8	M-10	SC-3	SC-7	SC-10	SS-4	SS-8	SS-11
1998												
1999	100.0	110.0	120.6	150.0	100.0	112.5	100.0	106.3	108.3			
2000	118.8	114.3	NS	114.3	100.0	100.0	137.5	114.3	NS	100.0	100.0	NS
2001	100.0	105.6	104.8	150.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	127.8	102.9	122.2	100.0	100.0

"NS" indicates that no students were tested in that subject/grade level.

* See the data notes in the Appendix for an explanation of the MAP Index.

MAP Index* - Missouri School for the Blind

	CA-3	CA-7	CA-11	M-4	M-8	M-10	SC-3	SC-7	SC-10	SS-4	SS-8	SS-11
1998				166.7	100.0	150.0						
1999	187.5	150.0	166.7	166.7	137.5	150.0	200.0	110.0	125.0			
2000	100.0	135.7	110.0	200.0	106.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	131.3	200.0	150.0	140.0
2001	166.7	166.7	150.0	100.0	112.5	158.3	133.3	137.5	175.0	100.0	156.3	168.8

* See the data notes in the Appendix for an explanation of the MAP Index.

Graduation and Dropout Rate Summary for State Operated Programs

	Graduation Rate (Number)			Dropout Rate (Number)		
	1999	2000	2001	1999	2000	2001
MSD	100.0% (15)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (14)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
MSB	100.0% (16)	100.0% (10)	100.0% (6)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
SSSH	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	89.9% (89)	16.7% (108)	16.4% (103)	1.7% (10)

Child Complaint and Due Process Data

In the past three years, MSB and MSD have had no child complaints filed or due process hearings requested against them. State Schools for the Severely Handicapped had two child complaints filed in FY2001 (one was withdrawn and the other found SSSH out of compliance, allegations dealt with the IEP) as well as one due process hearing request in which SSSH was found out of compliance.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.4.2: Concluded</p>	<p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Based on most recent special education monitoring data, State Board Operated Programs (SBOPs) students are generally receiving free appropriate public education (FAPE). In the future, all of these programs will be monitored through the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) as well as through special education. Missouri School for the Blind (MOB) and Missouri School for the Deaf (MAD) will be monitored in FY05 and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH) in FY06.</p> <p>Performance of students at MSB and MSD is poor. There has been some improvement at MSB over the past few years. MSD has shown little improvement. Most students at SSSH take the MAP-Alternate exam. Currently, only one year of MAP-Alternate data is available. Analysis of the MAP-Alternate results will be done as more years become available.</p> <p>Graduation and dropout data for the State Operated Programs is promising. Graduation rates of 100 percent for MSB and MSD indicate that all students who are eligible to graduate are indeed receiving diplomas. The jump in graduation rates for SSSH is due to policy changes. Prior to FY01, SSSH reported exiters as having received a certificate, which Missouri does not count as a graduate.</p>

Component GS.5*: Do appropriately trained public and private providers, administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and related service personnel provide services to children and youth with disabilities?

Overview Answer: Many factors shed light in this area, but do not fully answer the question. Additional analysis is needed. Teacher certification data shows that the percent of teachers not fully certified has increased over the past three years for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education programs. Data shows that caseloads are within acceptable ranges. There are no data available on contracted related services providers.

Strengths: The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is proactive in providing tuition reimbursement for teachers currently certified in regular education to pursue certification in special education. DESE also provides tuition reimbursement to paraprofessionals who have sixty college hours and have worked in a special education classroom for two years. Many types of professional development are available for educators in the state. Numerous efforts have been made to increase the numbers of fully certified personnel, including, but not limited to tuition reimbursement, distance learning grants, State Improvement Grants (SIG), temporary authorizations, etc. Related professional development is listed under each indicator. From the lists, it is clear that Missouri has a strong Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) program and that professional development is readily available to educators in the state.

Areas of Concern: There are shortages of special education teachers and there is some indication that not all special education teachers are properly certified. The strategy to increase the number of available teachers may result in a different standard for certification of teachers. As an example, regular education teachers are now allowed to take a test (Praxis) and receive a Missouri certificate to teach special education (cross-categorical mild to moderate). This will result in there being more special education certified teachers, but those teachers may not have the educational background and expertise to work with students with disabilities. Additional research is needed in this area to determine if this is a regional issue and how prevalent the problem is.

Other Comments: Several questions and issues need to be addressed. Strategies/questions suggested by the committee follow:

- What are the teacher/student ratios per district and how do they compare with the statewide ratio?
- Develop a database for looking at teacher qualifications, teacher certifications and caseloads.
- Determine whether pre-service and in-service trainings address the special knowledge, skills and abilities needed to serve the unique needs of children with disabilities, including those with low incidence disabilities.
- Determine what systems are in place for the recruitment of special education administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and related service providers.
- Identify the systems in place for the retention of special education administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and related service providers.

The committee was unable to reach consensus on the issue of defining “qualified personnel.” Missouri’s current data reflects numbers of teachers and ancillary personnel reported by districts on Core Data and represents individuals who hold Missouri Teacher Certification. Some members of the committee expressed concern that just using teacher certification as a benchmark for measuring qualified personnel would not adequately address the issue. There is a need to ensure that those individuals conducting evaluations are appropriately trained and knowledgeable in the area(s) they are assessing. The mere fact that they hold a state teaching credential was not considered sufficient by some committee members to equate to “qualified” personnel.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																																																												
<p>GS.5.1*: Are there sufficient numbers of qualified public and private providers, administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals and related service providers to meet the identified needs of all children with disabilities?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• State 618 data• Monitoring data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Autism – Applied Behavior Analysis Training• Mentoring for Success of Students with Disabilities (Grants and Manual) Resource Document• Missouri Teacher Certification Requirements• Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs (MoSTEP)• New Scripts Early Intervention/ Early Childhood Systems Change in Personnel Preparation• Orientation and Mobility Certification• Paraprofessional Core Manual• School Psychologist Intern Project• Traumatic Brain Injury	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Number (FTE) of Employed Fully Certified Personnel</th></tr><tr><th>Position</th><th>98-99</th><th>99-00</th><th>00-01</th></tr><tr><td>Special Education Teachers</td><td>7,911</td><td>8,116</td><td>8,077</td></tr><tr><td>Early Childhood Special Education Teachers</td><td>530</td><td>550</td><td>462</td></tr><tr><td>Process Coordinators</td><td>346</td><td>505</td><td>498</td></tr><tr><td>Special Education Directors</td><td>209</td><td>219</td><td>220</td></tr><tr><td>Paraprofessionals</td><td>5,993</td><td>7,034</td><td>7,299</td></tr><tr><td>Other Special Education and Related Services Personnel</td><td>1,215</td><td>1,713</td><td>1,884</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Total (FTE) Employed Teachers and Child Count</th></tr><tr><th colspan="4">School-Age</th></tr><tr><th>Year</th><th>FTE Teachers¹</th><th>Child Count²</th><th>Student/Teacher Ratio</th></tr><tr><td>1998-1999</td><td>8,413.84</td><td>124,606</td><td>14.81</td></tr><tr><td>1999-2000</td><td>8,723.99</td><td>127,225</td><td>14.58</td></tr><tr><td>2000-2001</td><td>8,696.64</td><td>129,347</td><td>14.87</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Early Childhood Special Education</th></tr><tr><th>Year</th><th>FTE Teachers³</th><th>Child Count⁴</th><th>Student/Teacher Ratio</th></tr><tr><td>1998-1999</td><td>623.46</td><td>6,965</td><td>11.17</td></tr><tr><td>1999-2000</td><td>646.34</td><td>7,725</td><td>11.95</td></tr><tr><td>2000-2001</td><td>552.63</td><td>8,036</td><td>14.54</td></tr></table> <p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. OSEP Table 2 - Personnel, Total FTE Employed, for Ages 6-212. State Profile Table 1, for Ages 5K-21+3. OSEP Table 2 - Personnel, Total FTE Employed, for Ages 3-54. State Profile Table 1, for Early Childhood, Ages 3-6(non-K)	Number (FTE) of Employed Fully Certified Personnel				Position	98-99	99-00	00-01	Special Education Teachers	7,911	8,116	8,077	Early Childhood Special Education Teachers	530	550	462	Process Coordinators	346	505	498	Special Education Directors	209	219	220	Paraprofessionals	5,993	7,034	7,299	Other Special Education and Related Services Personnel	1,215	1,713	1,884	Total (FTE) Employed Teachers and Child Count				School-Age				Year	FTE Teachers ¹	Child Count ²	Student/Teacher Ratio	1998-1999	8,413.84	124,606	14.81	1999-2000	8,723.99	127,225	14.58	2000-2001	8,696.64	129,347	14.87	Early Childhood Special Education				Year	FTE Teachers ³	Child Count ⁴	Student/Teacher Ratio	1998-1999	623.46	6,965	11.17	1999-2000	646.34	7,725	11.95	2000-2001	552.63	8,036	14.54
Number (FTE) of Employed Fully Certified Personnel																																																																													
Position	98-99	99-00	00-01																																																																										
Special Education Teachers	7,911	8,116	8,077																																																																										
Early Childhood Special Education Teachers	530	550	462																																																																										
Process Coordinators	346	505	498																																																																										
Special Education Directors	209	219	220																																																																										
Paraprofessionals	5,993	7,034	7,299																																																																										
Other Special Education and Related Services Personnel	1,215	1,713	1,884																																																																										
Total (FTE) Employed Teachers and Child Count																																																																													
School-Age																																																																													
Year	FTE Teachers ¹	Child Count ²	Student/Teacher Ratio																																																																										
1998-1999	8,413.84	124,606	14.81																																																																										
1999-2000	8,723.99	127,225	14.58																																																																										
2000-2001	8,696.64	129,347	14.87																																																																										
Early Childhood Special Education																																																																													
Year	FTE Teachers ³	Child Count ⁴	Student/Teacher Ratio																																																																										
1998-1999	623.46	6,965	11.17																																																																										
1999-2000	646.34	7,725	11.95																																																																										
2000-2001	552.63	8,036	14.54																																																																										

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.5.1*: Continued</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Personnel-1 – Caseloads of special education and related service personnel are within state standards: 8 of 83, 9.64 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Personnel-2 – The district implements procedures as required for any reported ancillary personnel: 7 of 65, 10.77 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Personnel-3 – The district follows proper procedures for hiring, training and reporting paraprofessionals: 8 of 92, 8.70 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Special Education and Related Services-3 – Special education and related services are provided as specified by the child's IEP: 15 of 100, 15.00 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Special Education and Related Services-4 – Children with disabilities receive the related services they need to enable them to benefit from special education: 12 of 98, 12.24 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Special Education and Related Services-5 – The kind and amount of related services is determined by the IEP team based on individual needs rather than factors such as administrative convenience or availability of personnel: 14 of 77, 18.18 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Special Education and Related Services-10 – Special education and related services are provided in a timely manner: 7 of 94, 7.45 percent of agencies noncompliant.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
GS.5.1*: Continued	Monitoring Indicator 100100 – Ancillary reporting																				
	<table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>Unknown*</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>Unknown</td><td>6</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>Unknown</td><td>8</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	Unknown*	0			FY2000	Unknown	6	Incomplete		FY2001	Unknown	8	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	Unknown*	0																		
	FY2000	Unknown	6	Incomplete																	
	FY2001	Unknown	8	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 100200 – Teacher caseloads																				
	<table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>Unknown*</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>Unknown</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>Unknown</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	Unknown*	3	Incomplete		FY2000	Unknown	3	Incomplete		FY2001	Unknown	3	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	Unknown*	3	Incomplete																	
	FY2000	Unknown	3	Incomplete																	
	FY2001	Unknown	3	Incomplete																	
	Monitoring Indicator 100300 – Paraprofessional assignments																				
	<table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>Unknown*</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>Unknown</td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>Unknown</td><td>3</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	Unknown*	0			FY2000	Unknown	0			FY2001	Unknown	3	Incomplete	
		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																
	FY1999	Unknown*	0																		
	FY2000	Unknown	0																		
FY2001	Unknown	3	Incomplete																		
* This information could not be queried from the database.																					
Refer to Indicator BF.2.1 for additional information.																					

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>GS.5.1*: Concluded</p>	<p>Committee Conclusions: We need further analysis to fully answer this indicator, however total Full Time Equivalent (FTE) has been increasing and average student/teacher ratios are within acceptable ranges. Monitoring data indicates that there is room for improvement in the area of provision of appropriate services, but it is unclear if this is due to a shortage of qualified personnel. More analysis needs to be done to truly answer this indicator including a regional analysis of the state.</p> <p>Following is a summary of Missouri's Special Education Comprehensive System of Professional Development (CSPD). A detailed list of programs/trainings is provided in the Appendix. CSPD:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supports the Missouri Special Education Performance Goals and Indicators; 2. Supports the Special Education Compliance Performance Requirements; 3. Is developed and delivered in accordance with the Missouri Professional Development Guidelines for Student Success (including the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) Standards); 4. Is developed and implemented as a collaborative effort with local school districts and agencies, parent and professional stakeholder organizations, Regional Professional Development Centers, and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) school initiatives and programs for all children, State Board of Education Operated Schools (SSSH, MSD, MSB), federal grants and programs, the Missouri Leadership Academy, and institutes of higher education; and 5. Is evaluated (data collected) based student performance impact relative to the Division Goals and Indicators and the Special Education Compliance Performance Requirements. Event or service data is also collected when applicable.